

CARMEL/CLAY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes

July 17, 2002

Jon Dobosiewicz – Carmel DOCS
Dean Groves – CINergy/PSI
Steve Broermann – Hamilton County Highway
Gary Hoyt – Carmel Fire Department
Steve Cash – Hamilton Co Surveyor Office

Laurence Lillig – Carmel DOCS
Ron Booher – CINergy/PSI
John Duffy – Carmel Utilities
John South – Hamilton Co Soil & Water
Dick Hill – Carmel Engineering

Sedgwick Subdivision (Secondary Plat & Construction Plans) 90-02SP

The applicant seeks approval of a Secondary Plat and Construction Plans for a 27-lot residential subdivision on 33.161± acres. The site is located on the north side of West 131st Street, ½ mile west of Towne Road. The site is zoned S-1/Residence - Estate.
Filed by David Warshauer for GWZ-1 Development, LLC.

David Warshauer for Banning Engineering presented the Secondary Plat and Construction Plans; also in attendance Lance Ferrell, Glenda Garrison with GWZ-1 Development and Mark Zukerman with GWZ-1 Development. Primary Plat for Sedgwick was approved in May. There are 27 lots that sit on about 33 acres between Shelborne Park subdivision, currently under construction, and Lakes of Hayden Run, under construction later this summer. The entry to Sedgwick will come off Lincolnshire Blvd which is the collector road being constructed north of 131st Street. It will connect Sedgwick, Shelborne Park, and Lakes of Hayden Run. Sedgwick has been working with the developer of Shelborne Park, Logan Limited, on a common drainage pond to the east of Lincolnshire Blvd and north of 131st Street. This would serve both Sedgwick and Shelborne Park.

After our Plan Commission meeting in May, the landowner who owns 7 acres at the southeast corner of Shelborne Park, Robert Gould requested that we expand the pond onto his property to provide him with an aesthetic feature and a buffer. Mr. Gould has a low area and part of the reason to expand the pond is to allow that low area to be aesthetically pleasing. We will do some grading around the area to help create a more uniform topography between Sedgwick and his property pursuant to reciprocal easement agreements. The maintenance of the pond would be by the Sedgwick and Shelborne Park Home Owners Association. In that pond on the Sedgwick side, we are looking to install a limestone identification feature, on an island or on a platform; we haven't designed it yet. It would basically be a limestone pillar that would provide some street presence on 131st Street. The developer of Shelborne Parks has gotten some comments from Steve Cash about the joint pond. Shelborne Park has to begin construction first and that they have done. The other issue that came up at the TAC meeting is the acquisition of right of way from Mr. Gould who owns 460 feet of frontage on 131st Street between the Lakes of Hayden Run and Shelborne Park. Sedgwick has about 230 feet of frontage that we are going to dedicate a 50' right of way. We had sent him a written offer last month, and while it had an expiration date in it, we never revoked it and continued to talk to him. I met with his attorney yesterday. He is concerned about three large trees that are in his front yard and is not willing at this point to sell the right of way. We thought we made a good offer to him for the full 50 feet. I got another call from him last night and he is strongly leaning toward agreeing to grant sufficient right of way that will allow us to widen the pavement and install the

stone shoulder so that we would at least have a consistent pavement all along 131st Street. He is also willing to talk to Carmel Utilities about a waterline easement. I believe we will be in a position to have a consistent pavement between the Lakes of Hayden Run all the way down to Shelborne Road.

Steve Broermann asked how far are those trees from the road? Lance Farrell was unsure. They sit back about 10 – 15' off the existing pavement. If we added 3' we would still like to keep minimum of 7' - 8' separation between the edges of that new pavement to those trees. But, I think it is more important to get the road in. Please keep us updated on how the acquisition is going. I think we will want to see it done no matter what. Will have to bore through pavement after laying the road. Lance was looking at getting on the backside of the trees. Does Mr. Gould have plans in the future on splitting that parcel?

John Duffy has called him but has not heard back.

David Warshauer has met with Mr. Gould a lot. Mr. Gould is realistic about what is happening on all sides around him. David says one of the reasons Mr. Gould wants to work with us on the pond and the grading is he wants it to look like it all belongs together and not stand out. At some point there will be an opportunity for somebody to grant additional right of way.

David Warshauer requested a form of dedication from Steve Broermann that can be used so that the County Highway will be satisfied with the language. Steve will comply.

John Duffy notes that water is coming in from the north from the Centex subdivision and should be ready in about two weeks. I will try to work with Mr. Gould on easement and get with him on the 21st of May for the north side of the road; it works better for us from the north side of road. Other than that, we will just see what happens.

David Warshauer talked with Mr. Gould's attorney last night. Mr. Gould was going out again to look at trees and he would like to be cooperative on that. We will continue to press that with him also.

Jon asks David Warshauer if the department could get together with him and Mr. Gould during his continued negotiations so we don't have to go through this twice? If we are still talking about the offer you made to him for right of way that is somewhat sufficient on acquiring the additional easement; we can commit to him that we are not going to remove the trees with the construction of the waterline easement. We don't want to get into those trees anymore than you do. The pathway is another issue that we would like to see continue across the front. We can back it off behind so we don't lose trees. We hope to get a public access easement pathway to connect Shelborne Park and Sedgwick with the Lakes at Hayden Run to be consistent with roadway approval. This way the path will blend in on either side (there should be a 10' asphalt path on 131st Street) and not dead end on either side of his property. One of two things will happen: people will run back up to road or cross his ground without a path back.

Gary Hoyt apologized he may not have sent David or Lance a letter. I have your information in my office and have looked at it. I can't remember if the information showed the water mains. Will hold my comments for now; if I have any questions I will give you a call.

John South from Hamilton County Soil and Water: Looks like most of your water will flow through Lot 27 on to Mr. Gould's property and we need something to prevent that. I would suggest a temporary swale

across Lot 27 to transfer that surface water (storm water) into pond. If I recall right, the pond is specified in the construction sequence to come fairly early in the program.

Lance met with the contractor last week – trying to work out a deal where that front pond can get constructed in the first phase. That is where a lot of the water from property will go as well. I agree with you John that is of crucial.

John South also believes there is an 8” tile that exists and needs to be abandoned correctly, probably from the pond. Needs to be properly plugged at the property line. This way it does not drain your pond and does not damage his drain tile.

Jon Dobosiewicz will get a letter to the petitioner regarding the secondary plat just to be consistent with a couple of requirements. Briefly, a recommendation is not to include addresses, on the plat. I will get that letter out next week so you will know what needs to be included. Monumentation, you might want to look into ordinance control on monumentation; will get additional information to the petitioner.

Laurence Lillig made several notes on the plat that he is sure Jon will include in his letter to the petitioner. Laurence didn’t find a copy of the covenants and restrictions in the file; David Warshauer will submit the most recent draft.

Laurence noted paths are outside of the right of way. Those need to be put in a public pedestrian access easement, and should be available for use by the public. The easement is same type. David says the covenants and restrictions will define access easements, and will show in the covenants and restrictions that these are available to the public.

Laurence Lillig said the subdivision signage proposed on 131st Street does require Plan Commission approval so they will have to go to the committee, once it is approved, the sign permit will be issued.

David Warshauer asks if that applies to the sign they have at Lincolnshire (a small monument sign that was shown as part of the landscaping)? Laurence notes that if it was in the material submitted to the PC then it can be approved-that design can serve as being approved.

Jon is having the city attorney prepare a document with regard to annexation. This will be in addition to what we would like to see in the covenants and restrictions. We foresee moving forward on annexation of this area mid 2003, and want to be in a position to have agreements when you request water availability. We are considering implementing a new process through the issuance of the building permit as well as the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. We can place people on notice that the area is to be annexed by the city. We are just trying to a better job of marketing so people have a clear understanding.

Ron from CINergy asks about latest set of prints for new service request. Suggestion is to get email address from David for new auto file and the phone number for the new service request. Jon asks about information from the sanitary district. The plans do not show the most current revision to their specifications.

Lakeside Park Subdivision (Primary Plat) 94-02 PP

The applicant seeks approval to plat a 215-lot residential subdivision on 154.8± acres. The site is located on the southwest corner of West 141st Street and Towne Road. The site is zoned S-1/Residence - Estate. Filed by Dennis Olmstead of Stoeppelwerth & Associates, Inc. for Roehling Enterprises, Inc.

Ray Roehling, developer, Dennis Olmstead, Mark Monroe, and Paul Reis for the petitioner.

Ray Roehling pinpointed subject site on map; southwest quadrant of 141st Street and Towne Road in West Clay Township; residential subdivision with 215 lots proposed. Everyone should have received plans on it. I have received one letter from the highway department, but have not yet reviewed it.

Ron Booher and Dean Groves from CINergy did not get plans. Please send plans to Guilford office. Dennis Olmstead will send plans to Ron tomorrow morning.

Steve Broermann did send out a letter from the county highway department. Dennis may not have had time to receive it. I don't have anything else at this time.

Dennis remarks they will follow through on the suggestions in the letter. There is one tough area (150' semi-circle) to deal with, but I think we can work it out.

Steve Broermann can justify asking for a variance. I have not talked with Les Locke about it; he might not have a problem with it. I will check with Locke on Monday and get his feel for the curve and common area.

Gary Hoyt apologizes for not getting letter out. Disregard last comment about the loop common area 16. Looking at plat, turning radius for 24' wide street is no problem. No fire hydrant locations; water mains are marked well but hydrants need to be shown. Are the two dead ends that run off the west side of this project (north and south end) going to eventually run into something? Dennis confirmed they would tie into the Ridge of Hayden Run. It does not exist but it is planned, it is an approved primary plat addition. Gary is not going to worry about asking for a temporary turnaround. If you have an amenity building, I would like to see a Knox box installed.

John South submitted comment letter regarding the last test on primary soil types. John is concerned about how you get to the profile of your soil type-recommends boring. Developer representative states they have checked it out and have done extensive boring in that area. According to Patriot Engineer, there are no limitations and no concerns. John notes, too poorly drained soil, we recommend all lots have access to subdivision drain tile. John also would like to see capping of existing well and deal with offsite watershed to the west (Ridge at Hayden Run). The only other comment is try to maintain existing soil conditions in common area-might be a good place to put some of your topsoil for future to promote better growing environment.

Jon Dobosiewicz addressed the traffic study requested by county highway department. Petitioner should contact engineer and submit "traffic" study for this property; prepare an executive summary of that report, and provide that in lieu of going through the entire process of preparing a brand new traffic study. In particular submit the intersection information, so we don't have to ask the Plan Commission to sift through the entire study that was prepared for the hearing. Note special details that would affect this site. With regard to annexation, the Plan Commission's attorney is preparing a document that would be above

and beyond what we have asked that you include in your covenants and restrictions. When you seek water availability, you need to sign an agreement for annexation. In addition, the city is formulating a new policy on issuance of building permits as well as certificate of occupancy. This will put individuals and builders on notice that annexation is being planned and eminent for this parcel. My best guess, with the effectiveness of the C210, (an area which gets us over to Saddle Creek and Towne Road) and there is not a remonstrative to slow down that process, this parcel will be annexed into city mid to late 2003.

With regard to the widening along Towne Road, we would like to ask that you work with the cutout parcel and acquire the initial right of way so that we can make the minimal level of improvement across the frontage. The site that the tower sits on is a cutout; that parcel was attached to the other approximately 4 – 5 acres adjacent to that parcel. I would advise that you look at the tower ordinance to confirm that we are not creating any proximity of residential lots for placing any additional antenna on that particular tower. The tower ordinance speaks of 200' distance from tower to adjoining platted residential property. The proximity of Lot 170 and Lot 129 might inhibit us to administratively adhere to that guideline.

As with other subdivisions, recently approved, we would be looking for improvements to Towne Road and 146th Street consistent with the Thoroughfare Plan. In lieu of that, the minimum requirements requested by the Marion County Highway Department with a commitment to either construct or contribute to improvements within a mile proximity of this site. That is something we want to sit down and iron out before primary plat approval. It is not something that we need to necessarily have before. I just want to bring it to your attention and we can come to an understanding prior to committee that meets the first week of September.

Last item, we may require a waiver for common areas Lot 64-69 (64 interior). My preference would be that the driveway be included within right of way if we can have Plan Commission approval. I know the city will accept it if you design it in that manner. You will need a waiver if you don't and variances because those lots don't have frontage on a private street. I want to accommodate both ways. This is section two which probably won't be until Fall 2004 or approximately time of plat. If it is in the city, I can address it. If it is still in the county, we can serve both concerns. I foresee it in the right of way, is the common area, which would just be the island in the middle. We can work that out as far as getting the primary plat approved. We can bring that up with the committee. Dennis would prefer to put in a right of way.

Steve says they are concerned about the centerline radius. Dennis states centerline is 85'. Steve wants to know if there is any way to get it to 100'; if so, we can grant variance. Dennis will have to check and get back on this.

Jon adds if there is a necessity to file a waiver based on this design, there is currently a new process, which requires notice only through newspapers so we don't have to send out notice to adjoining owners to the primary plat. This reduces the notice to 10 days as opposed to the 25 days required - if plans cannot be modified to meet requirement on the waivers regarding the Certificate of Occupancy. In the past, we have asked the Plan Commission to waive their Rules and accept the reduced notice deadlines for this purpose. The waivers are a part of the primary plat. I think we are over notifying, if anything.

Shelborne Greene, Section 8, Plat Vacation 93-02 PV

The petitioner seeks to vacate Section 8 of the Shelborne Green Subdivision. The site is located on the east side of Shelborne Road, 1/8 mile north of West 96th Street. The site is zoned R-1/Residence. Filed by Charles D. Frankenberger of Nelson & Frankenberger for the Evangelical Baptist Missions.

Charlie Frankenberger represents the Evangelical Baptist Missions. EBM is requesting approvals necessary to place their Administrative Office on the southeast corner of 96th Street and Shelborne. The approvals needed in order to obtain a building permit are a Use Variance and a Plat Covenant Vacation. At 96th Street and Shelborne Road, the real estate acquired by the church is Lot 331, which is the only lot in Section 8 together with a rectangle parcel south of that. This is Lot 331 in Section 8 and the balance of the real estate. We are acquiring this portion of this parcel; the College Park Baptist Church owns it. The real estate is zoned residential to permit the use and we also need to vacate this plat. The covenants are applicable to the real estate now. Regarding the covenants, I have had conversations with the owner, Davis Development. Their research has concluded that the original umbrella of covenants applicable to Shelborne Greene were amended three times to include additional real estate. They were expanded per their terms to include additional real estate. They were never expanded to include this particular lot. So they have concluded that this lot-even though the plat erroneously states that it is subject to the covenants-the covenants were never amended to include this lot. So we have to figure out how that will play in our request for plat and plat vacation. We will proceed with Plan Commission to vacate the plat and covenants to the extent that they might apply. We are here today to respond to comments and suggestions.

CINergy – no comments

Steve Broermann has no objections; asked about the process on the plat vacation. Charlie Frankenberger notes that the process will be that we appear before the Plan Commission. I don't know if PC will send us to committee (typically they do) that is Subdivision Committee and then back to PC for a vote.

Laurence asks if they have prepared a vacation document. Charlie has not yet prepared the document. The findings of fact and the final document will be certified and recorded.

Jon suggests an example can be used. Jon notes the county attorney in their preparation of a vacation for Danbury Estates, went to the Plan Commission back in March.

Laurence asks if they will want to keep the right of way. Charlie is willing to do that. Is there a concern? Charlie believes the roads do not affect them. Laurence notes the plat dedicated right of way is not affected by 45'. We are concerned about the dedication of the lot.

Jon asks if we vacate the plat, are we also being asked to vacate the dedication to the public for right of way? Are there easements we need to be concerned about?

Laurence knows of a sanitary sewer easement, a drainage easement, and a utility easement next to the right of way.

Various conversations: Steve would like to know if this is whole or part. John South needs to know if they approve one or the other. Will this be required to be platted? Laurence says there is nothing in the

ordinance to be platted. Jon will move forward to land use variance – parent tract. Will they come this far north? Either circle or cul de sac? Steve thinks it needs to be vacated.

Steve Cash asks if we are going to see this again? If so, our office will not have an objection.

Laurence says petitioner will be put on TAC and BZA Agenda for August. once Use Variance is filed.

Gary Hoyt will send out a letter to Adam DeHart. Gary would also like to see hydrants as close to the fire department connection as possible. Run along the island at the south portion of the property. Patch near the waterline-this gives us a fire hydrant within that 50'. We also request an exterior door to riser room and a Knox box. In regard to planning, something the department wants me to start bringing up, if the building is going to have an alarm system, we would like to see the panel be located at the front of the building.

Adam asks if the fire department want to hook up pumper to 6" line (to boost our sprinkler system) rather than off the 12" line? A sprinkler head with one or two pop offs? Gary suggests that the department does not want the costs to be too high and in consideration of that the 6" would work fine. Of course, we would like to have the 12" if possible. Adam asks if the connection should be closer to the street (siamese connection). Adam thinks it is a littler cheaper and would work excellent for the fire department. Gary will get a letter out today.

John South does not have comments on the plat vacation, but has put together a letter regarding the site plan. On less than 5 acre, you do not need to worry. Show more details on the plans as it is customary. We recommend you show construction limits-minimum north side limits to show gas lines. You will need signage to keep contractors out. Show seeding for offsite storm sewer. They are still in the process of negotiation on the storm sewers.

Jon asks a question regarding old church. "Is that's why project has not been done"?

Laurence questions site of cemetery; county made an offer to church. Brenwick and Davis made a voluntary contribution to improve intersection. Jon notes south portion of the property is to be developed. In light of land use variance, we will be looking for "acres around tract" for a dedication right of way.

Charlie notes they are difficult to "Master Plan" with.

Dean Groves, CINergy, this is IPL territory.

Charlie questions 60' at intersection, none there now. Adam DeHart notes a 20' CPB partial and 45' for both. Adam remarks this is a secondary path. Is the dedication at 96th Street only?

Jon asked Steve Broermann to acquire right of way between the county and the church.

Charlie shows 96th and Shelborne dedication off the parent tract (6 Acre). Because you are being asked for 1.5 acres of real estate, you are required to dedicate right of way 11 acres-this deal might evaporate. This does not give them any method of seeking compensation for the right of way.
CONCERN: cannot resolve before BZA/TAC in August.

Jon would like to know if they expand on their site, will they seek advice from an attorney? I'm not opposed to the county's offer being accepted but I think they should realize the alternatives.

Laurence looks at landscape plan. Scott Brewer might have some questions.

Adam DeHart will work directly with Scott on trees for buffer. We will also have to work with the gas company regarding the earthen mounds and trees (5' high). We will talk with gas company first. There have been comments from neighbors about "planting on the hill". I will have to work this out with Scott. We will try to do creative stuff.

St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Parish Rectory SUA-91-02

The petitioner has received Special Use Amendment approval in order to construct a rectory. The site plan is revised from that reviewed by TAC on May 22, 2002.

The site is located at 10655 Haverstick Road. The site is zoned S-1/Residence - Low Density.

Filed by Charles D. Frankenberger of Nelson & Frankenberger for St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Parish.

In attendance, parishioner and presenter Charlie Frankenberger, for Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton Catholic Church located on the northeast corner of 106th and Haverstick. Also present on behalf of the church, are Father Brian Dudzinski and Claire Magna, and Michael Grove. Petitioner obtained BZA special use approvals necessary to build the rectory and the northeast corner of our site. The BZA approval was conditioned upon returning to TAC because of some revisions. The site plan originally reviewed as part of the TAC submittals was modified to move the rectory farther south in order to provide greater tree preservation between the northern boundary of the rectory and the homeowners of Carolina Commons. That was one change. The landscape tree preservation plans that did correspond to that change, the site plan did not. We moved the circular, primarily pedestrian, entrance to the rectory a little bit east and that slightly modified the tree preservation area. As a safety precaution, Laurence wanted us to return to TAC for those changes.

CINergy no problem.

Steve Cash asks about the building being moved (30-40'), has that moved you any closer to open drain "creek"? Michael Grove, we just moved it back to where we started, so slope up was not so extreme.

Steve notes if within 75' of bank, this might be encroaching on county easement. Regarding the existing well, is it off the property line or within church boundary?

Sister Claire will have it capped as a safety precaution.

Gary Hoyt, no comments

John South, no comments

Dick Hill, City engineering, questions new driveway.

Charlie has received from Schneider the drawing that shows the dedication of the segment west of the house on 106th and north of Haverstick. I will have that for you after signature from diocese.

Laurence questioned whether Bill Akers has received address? Will they share mail service on one address, same piece of ground, -one as B and one as A.

Gary Hoyt will not be able to use 10655? Public safety issue. Access off 106th for safety.

Hazel Dell Christian Church Modular Classrooms (Special Use Amendment)

The petitioner seeks Special Use Amendment approval in order to locate four (4) modular classrooms on site. The site is located at 14501 Hazel Dell Parkway. The site is zoned S-1/Residence - Low Density. Filed by Alan K. Peterson for Hazel Dell Christian Church.

Present for petitioner: Alan Peterson, property chairman for Hazel Dell Christian Church, requesting a Special Use Variance in order to place four modular classrooms on the south side of the building, a temporary use, while we go through our two million dollar expansion to the building. We will be able to use these for up to two years until the building is constructed will provide Laurence with photos of buildings. Hazel Dell Christian Church is located on Hazel Dell Parkway just south of 146th Street. Would like to place the four classrooms on the south side of the building with a 20' easement to the existing building. This is a 33,000 SF facility and we are looking at a 16,000 SF building next to it. We hope to locate the classrooms, which are 24 x 48 on this ground. Electric access is on this side of the building. Storms McMullen & Company will trench power and have already brought power into the entire facility.

CINergy requests information about electrical access.

Steve Cash points out dotted line on drawing. Did original subdivision show this 3 years ago? The Master Plan is to have full electrical access.

Alan notes that the Dodd Farm was in the original area. The two million dollar project was to perhaps finish out this road. This can be extended. - will decide later.

Gary Hoyt asks for access back to trailers to get to the building. These are standard modular trailers for education, the "New Castle" modular. Do these typically have fire alarm systems wired into them? Gary will get a letter out to you.

Alan will set two modules immediately and two more in a year or so. Our plans are to start no later than the spring of 2004.

Steve has no problem with the detention area, it is satisfactory. No further comments.

Dick Hill would like to receive a copy of the information; Alan may have misunderstood the process. Plans should be forwarded to the engineer. Dick recalls that originally we exempted part of the church from water fees based on size of church - we need to go back and reexamine this.

Alan notes no sewer or water for these classrooms.

Jon questions will church come back to set fees and budget for fees in expansion? We will be looking for

additional right of way dedication. This exact plan is what BZA referred to originally. You will need to meet with engineering to see when this is implemented. My advice is that they budget for improvements and dedication. We do not want it to come to them as a surprise

John South, no comment.

Laurence will get a TAC list to Alan before he leaves so he can get the plans out to them.

Lakes at Hayden Run, Section 1, Block A (Special Use)

The petitioner seeks Special Use approval in order to construct an amenity area on 1.249±.

The site is located northwest of the intersection of West 131st Street and Towne Road. The site is zoned S1/Residence - Estate.

Filed by Thomas L. Kutz of Centex Homes.

Thomas Kutz for Centex Homes, requesting approval to construct the amenity area of Lakes of Hayden Run. This basically sits in the middle of Section 1, which was approved a few months ago

Ron from CINergy would like to have a load sheet; can fax over a sheet as an example. Ron anticipated some of the load and sat the transformer close and used larger wires. I also need a meter base location. We will have a pedestal location.

Tom Kutz points out a baby pool pump and lighting requirements. Ron, you have made this similar to our Royal Woods in Fishers. We will sit storage room here and meter setting in this location.

Ron needs meter base "close to source". We can run larger wire to get closer. We can't change transformer; you will have to pay for transformer if it is completed this way. Because there is a lot of parking lot involved, we would like for you to run conduit to pedestal.

Various comments: Tom, trench, sidewalk? Ron, fence to walk-need a little more than 10' Tom we now have 8', put a conduit here? Ron will look at it further and get with Tom. Ron, I do not have jurisdiction over that. Tom, easier to come in other side, already designed and state approved. Jon asks if they are looking to pull permit before secondary plat approval? Tom says no.

Steve did you receive my letter? Nothing to add unless you have questions about my letter.

Tom would like to maintain curb cut

Jon did you show depressed curb and ADA for sidewalks, right of way? Where is the jogging trail? I'm talking about entrance to pool and sidewalk. Is this a roll curb or built on (not curb on top of curb)? Make sure it is designed right LEAVE ROLL CURB IN PLACE.

Ed Fleming says we are showing as a handicap now.

Tom, we will note on site plan as handicapped.

Steve Cash notes parking lot is over storm sewers. Let's check plans for landscaping. No conflicts with the storm sewers.

Tom, did we do that in plan one? note storm sewer 207. In phase one, we have it on sheet four.

Steve, some trees are planted over drip line. Trees must be extended out over pipe.

Tom, regarding drip line in the right of way, is it okay to hang over the drip line?

Steve, "yes it is okay".

Laurence, is this a swale coming across the north? Do you plan to make a path?

Tom and Ed, "yes".

Gary Hoyt has not sent comment letter yet but will. Requests Knox box for access. Will provide petitioner with an application; just contact office.

Tom, can you send specification sheet for residential? Who is supplier?

Gary, the supplier is out of CA and they will mail it to you.

John South, requests erosion control on the plan.

Jon asks what is size of pool? Tom responds it is 1,199SF. Jon notes it needs to be 2,000SF. Jon will provide a letter.

Laurence says landscaping will need to be approved by Scott Brewer. It needs to meet requirements in SEC 26.4, buffer and residential uses. Laurence would like to know if they did a fence detail, and an elevation of site. Is there signage for pool?

Tom may place a small "POOL THIS WAY" sign but it will not be a permanent sign.

Laurence notes petitioner actually filed a secondary plat application; special use application is needed. As Jon mentioned regarding sidewalks, and general layout, paths internal to the site need to be in place.

Jon suggests you modify the designs of common areas, easement to pathway, pedestrian access easement and trails. It might be simpler to modify language of common areas. Is there a 10' path?

Tom we will plat as common areas.

Laurence says secondary plat has been filed but needs to be recorded. Laurence would like to know if there is exterior lighting, identical to Haverstick Pool. Laurence will get revised application on file and will get address.

Tom notes there will be coach lights on columns and lights for pool at nighttime.